

[18th August 1925]

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“ As regards the first part of the answer, the last sentence reads : ‘ The Government have sanctioned his retention in the post till about October 1925 in the public interests.’ May I know what the public interest is ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ It is due to the fact that there was a change of Commissioners just at the time and it was thought well to keep on the Assistant Secretary for a few more months.”

Initial salaries of Revenue subordinates in Tanjore district.

* 24 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Board of Revenue have issued orders on 14th March 1925 to the effect that the initial salaries of Revenue subordinates below Rs. 100 in the Tanjore district should take effect from 1st August 1924 and not from 1st March 1921 as in the rest of the Presidency ; and

(b) the reason for this discrimination ?

A.—(a) The Collector of Tanjore fixed the initial salaries of some of the Revenue subordinates in his district on 16th September 1921 and of the rest on 6th January 1922 and gave effect to them from 1st March 1921 as in the rest of the Presidency. On appeals from some of them in regard to the initial pay fixed for them the Board of Revenue directed that the initial pay should be fixed with reference to seniority in the district establishment as a whole. This led to the revision of the initial pay of some of the subordinates.

In the proceedings of the Board of Revenue referred to in the question, the Board informed the Collector that effect should be given to the final revision of the initial salaries not from 1st March 1921 but from the date of order sanctioning it and that the subordinates should be started on that date at the stage in the time-scale which they would have reached on that date, had effect been given to the revision from 1st March 1921. The Government have issued further orders that until the date of the Collector's order revising their initial pay, they should be allowed the pay originally fixed for them together with the increments due to them in the interval.

(b) The delay in fixing the initial pay finally was due to appeals against the original orders of the Collector. The orders above passed are fair to all concerned having regard to this delay.

Village Establishments.

Members of depressed classes among village officials.

* 25 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the total number of village monigars, karnams and assistant karnams in service belonging to the depressed classes together with their names, and the taluks and districts in which they discharge their duties ;

18th August 1925]

(b) whether any of the posts, viz., village monigars, karnams and assistant karnams, occupied by the depressed classes were offered to caste people and they were confirmed during the last five years for some reasons or other; and

(c) if so, the reasons for such action?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) Information on the points referred to is not on record.

Mr. R. VEERIAN:—“ I find that the answer given to the whole of my question is as follows: ‘ Information on the points referred to is not on record ’. May I know therefore, Sir, whether the Government are going on with their administration without maintaining any record whatsoever? ”

Amalgamation of Jillopanayakkanpalaiyam and Valaiyapalaiyam villages.

* 26 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the villages of Jillopanaickanpalayam and Valayapalayam in Udumalpet taluk of Coimbatore district have been recently grouped together; if so, when and how many months after the Legislative Council passed a resolution against such amalgamations; and

(b) the reasons for the amalgamation; and whether the Board of Revenue took the Council's resolution into consideration before ordering the amalgamation; if the order was made before the resolution, whether the Board took any action to prevent effect being given to the order in view of the resolution and the undertaking given at the time by the Government practically to the effect that no more amalgamations would be effected?

A.—(a) Yes; this is the case referred to in the answer to question No. 1468 answered at the meeting of 6th December 1924. The regrouping was ordered on 15th September 1924.

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (c) of the question referred to above.

Criminal Tribes Act.

Extension of the Criminal Tribes Act to Dandasis in Ganjam district.

* 27 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasaya: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether and when the Criminal Tribes Act was extended to the Dandasis of Ganjam district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the village vettis and talaiyaris in the Ganjam district are almost exclusively recruited from this class;

(c) whether the Dandasis are a wandering tribe;

(d) what is their population and how many of them approximately do not have ostensible means of livelihood or occupation;

(e) whether any of their class is without house and occupation; and

(f) whether he is aware that they are generally trusted as watchers of property, etc.?